DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 366 367 JC 940 080

TITLE	Campus Planning Study: Staff Recommendations.
INSTITUTION	Washington State Higher Education Coordinating Board, Olympia.
PUB DATE	30 Nov 93
NOTE	40p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	College Planning; *Community Attitudes; Community Colleges; *Educational Facilities; Educational Legislation; Educational Policy; *Facility Planning; Needs Assessment; Participative Decision Making; *School Construction; *Shared Facilities; *Site Selection; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

In keeping with the State of Washington capital budget allocations for 1991-1993, and with provisions of the 1993-95 state budget proposal, the state Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) undertook a study to determine a preferred organizational model for the construction of a new community college to serve the north King and south Snohomish Counties area. The three-part study utilized an independent consultant to provide an impartial assessment of postsecondary education needs in the study area; established a project coordination team (PCT), consisting of representatives of the University of Washington (UW), the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges, Shoreline Community College, and the HECB Office of Financial Management; and solicited public comment through two public meetings concerning the consultant's findings and recommendations. Based on an examination of enrollment needs, the assessment of community attitudes, and a comparative evaluation of alternative models, the following conclusions and recommendations emerged: (1) the co-location of the new college with a planned upper division/graduate branch of UW was the preferred organizational structure; and (2) among three proposed sites examined, the Truly Farm property is the only viable option for the location of the dual campus. A review of the legislative background to the proposed new community college, a discussion of three proposed sites, a list of consultant recommendations, and the PCT and public hearing comments are included. (PAA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 366 367

Richard R. Sonstelie
Chair
Mercer Island

Ann Daley
Olympia

Mary James
Toppenish

Vicki McNeill
Spokane

Gay Selby
Kelso

David Shaw
Richland

David K.Y. Tang
Seattle

Elson S. Floyd
Executive Director

CAMPUS PLANNING STUDY: STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Sainsbury

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

JC 940 080

WASHINGTON STATE
HIGHER EDUCATION COORDINATING BOARD

NOVEMBER 30, 1993

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table of Contents

Resolution 93-36 i

I. Overview of the Study Project and Staff Recommendation 1

II. Policy Context of the Campus Planning Study 2

III. Review and Analysis of Consultant's Findings and Recommendations 6

- Determination of Enrollment Needs 7
- Assessment of Community Attitudes 8
- Comparative Evaluation of Alternative Models 9
- Site Feasibility Assessment 15

IV. Assessment of Consultant's Recommendations 25

V. Staff Recommendations 30

VI. Appendices (available upon request)

Appendix A: Summary and Text of Sections 106, 716, and 745 of the 1993-1995 Capital Appropriations Act

Appendix B: Members of the Project Coordination Team

Appendix C: Transcripts of the September 2, 1993 "Public Forum" and the October 27, 1993 "Public Hearing"

Appendix D: Site Selection for Bothell/Woodinville Area Branch Campus, HECB staff report, December 12, 1990

Appendix E: Transcript of December 12, 1990 HECB Action on Bothell Campus Site Selection

Appendix F: Governor Gardner's Proposal for Cascade State University

Appendix G: North King/South Snohomish Counties Campus Planning Study & Related Budget Proviso, HECB, May 26, 1993

Appendix H: Description of Alternative Organizational Models and Evaluation Matrix Used by MGT of America

Appendix I: UW, SBCTC, OFM Comments/Responses to MGT Findings and Recommendations

Appendix J: Site Summary: Montevilla, Truly Farm, Wellington Hills

Appendix K: Test of Fit for Co-location of CC and UWBC on Truly Farm Site, NBBJ, October 27, 1993

RICHARD R. SONSTELIE
Chair

ELSON S. FLOYD
Executive Director

STATE OF WASHINGTON
HIGHER EDUCATION COORDINATING BOARD
917 Lakeridge Way • PO Box 43430 • Olympia, Washington 98504-3430 • (206) 753-2210 • (SCAN) 234-2210 • (FAX) 753-1784

RESOLUTION 93-36

WHEREAS, Section 716 of the 1993-1995 Capital Appropriations Act (Chapter 2, Laws of 1993), directs the Higher Education Coordinating Board to conduct a study (entitled, "Campus Planning Study") of alternative organizational models for meeting the higher education and workforce training needs of the people of the north King and south Snohomish Counties area; and

WHEREAS, Section 716 of the 1993-1995 Capital Appropriations Act also directs the Higher Education Coordinating Board to determine, pursuant to the Campus Planning Study, a preferred organizational model for the study area and to submit recommendations to the Governor and appropriate legislative committees by November 30, 1993; and

WHEREAS, Section 106 of the 1993-1995 Capital Appropriations Act (Chapter 2, Laws of 1993), directs the Higher Education Coordinating Board to evaluate a minimum of four sites for the acquisition of property for a new institution of higher education in the study area; and

WHEREAS, To carry out these legislative directives, the Board retained MGT of America, Inc., (hereinafter referred to as the "Consultant") to provide an impartial assessment of postsecondary education needs in the study area and an evaluation of the relative efficacy of alternative organizational models and sites for meeting those needs; and

WHEREAS, The Board, as part of the Campus Planning Study, established a Project Coordination Team consisting of representatives of the University of Washington, State Board for Community and Technical Colleges, Shoreline Community College, and the Office of Financial Management to provide expert program consultation and advice to MGT of America Inc., and the HECB staff on matters pertaining to the study; and

WHEREAS, the Consultant submitted the final report of findings and recommendations concerning the evaluation of alternative organizational models and sites for meeting the postsecondary needs of the study area to the Board on October 18, 1993; and

WHEREAS, the Consultant has concluded that the best organizational model for meeting the postsecondary needs of the study area is one that collocates a new community college with the branch campus of the University of Washington; and

WHEREAS, the Consultant found three sites, known as Montevilla, Truly Farm, and Wellington Hills, programmatically suitable to support the collocation of the new community college with the branch campus of the University of Washington; and

WHEREAS, public comment was provided to the Consultant in the formulation of its findings at a public forum held on September 2, 1993 in Bothell, Washington; and

WHEREAS, additional public comment concerning the Consultant's final report of findings and recommendations was received by the Board at a public hearing held at Lake Washington Technical College on October 27, 1993; and

WHEREAS, staff of the Higher Education Coordinating Board have, in consultation with the members of the Project Coordination Team, reviewed the study methodology, findings, and recommendations provided by the Consultant, and based on such review, and in consideration of the public comments provided at the two aforementioned public meetings, have prepared a staff report, entitled "Campus Planning Study: Staff Recommendations," dated November 10, 1993; and

WHEREAS, the Executive Director of the Higher Education Coordinating Board has transmitted the staff report to the Board and is proposing Board action on the recommendations contained in that staff report; and

WHEREAS, the Board has reviewed the staff analysis and recommendations submitted by the Executive Director and, based on that review has incorporated said staff report in its action to adopt the recommendation advanced by the Executive Director;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, The Higher Education Coordinating Board hereby adopts the following policies and actions in response to the requirements set forth in Sections 106 and 716 of the 1993-1995 Capital Appropriations Act (Chapter 2, Laws of 1993):

1. The Board supports the creation of a new community college in the north King/south Snohomish Counties area and reaffirms its commitment to the continuation of the upper division and graduate level branch campus of the University of Washington.

2. The Board adopts the collocation of the new community college and upper division and graduate branch of the University of Washington as its preferred organizational model for meeting the higher education and workforce training needs of the north King/south Snohomish Counties area.

3. The Board endorses increasing enrollments and use of existing capacity at Lake Washington Technical College, area community colleges, and the UW branch campus at Canyon Park as an effective response to the immediate postsecondary access needs of the north King/south Snohomish Counties area.

4. The Board will adopt, by March 1, 1994, a philosophical statement of policy for the planning and operation of the collocated campus. This statement of policy shall be prepared by HECB staff in consultation with the participating institutions and the Office of Financial Management.

5. The Board directs the participating institutions to develop and recommend, pursuant to the policies adopted under Recommendation #4 above, a joint planning and operating agreement for the collocated campus. Such agreement should address, but not be limited to, the following issues:

   A. Definition of the respective roles and authorities of the participating institutions in governance of the collocated campus.

B. Designation of responsibility for managing the facilities planning and development process (including responsibility for preparing the Environmental Impact Statement(s), and acting in the role of "owner" for the administration of Architectural/ Engineering Agreements and Public Works Construction Contracts).

C. Specification of policies, procedures and authorities for the scheduling and assignment of common use program space and for the operations and management of central service functions and space.

The Board further directs the participating institutions to submit this agreement by June 30, 1994 to the Board for review and approval. Further, if by June 30, 1994, the agreement has not been perfected, then the participating institutions are directed to submit, by June 30, 1994, a report on the status of the agreement. If such report indicates that an impasse exists on any issues integral to the governance, planning or operation of the campus, then the Board shall make the final determination on such issues. Additionally, the Board hereby directs staff to consult with the Office of Financial Management and other appropriate agencies in the formulation of recommendations to the Board concerning these matters.

6. The Board endorses the continuation of the existing institutional advisory groups and encourages their participation and representation in the development of the requested joint planning and operating agreement provided for in Recommendation #5 above.

7. The Board designates the Truly Farm site as the preferred location for the collocated campus and recommends to the Office of Financial Management that property acquisition procedures be initiated following:

A. The final wetlands determination by the U.S. Corps of Engineers,

B. Verification of the capacity of the site to fully accommodate the projected student enrollment level of 9,900 FTE pursuant to the final wet lands determination at an acceptable cost,

C. Completion of a Preliminary EIS, and

D. Securing a fair and reasonable purchase price for the property.

8. The Board recommends to the executive and legislature that the State retain ownership of Wellington Hills and that, notwithstanding current urban growth area boundaries, this property be considered a resource for meeting the future postsecondary needs of the region.

Adopted:

November 19, 1993

Attest:

Richard R. Sonstelie, Chair

Gay Selby, Acting Secretary

I. Overview of the Study Project and Staff Recommendation

This report presents staff recommendations for a preferred organizational model for meeting the postsecondary educational needs of the north King and south Snohomish Counties area. Additionally, staff present findings and recommendations concerning the siting of new educational facilities in the study area. The staff report is the culmination of a six-month study project, termed the "Campus Planning Study," which was conducted pursuant to directives of the 1993 Legislature.[1] These directives, in part, require the Board to recommend a preferred organizational model for the study area and to "report its decision to the governor, appropriate legislative committees, and affected institutions by November 30, 1993." Additionally, the Board is required to evaluate a minimum of four sites for a new higher education institution in the study area.

To fulfill the legislative intent of these directives, the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB or, the Board) formulated a three-part project plan for conducting the Campus Planning Study. The first component of the study plan utilized an independent consultant, MGT of America, Inc., to provide an impartial assessment of postsecondary education needs in the study area and an evaluation of the relative efficacy of alternative organizational models and sites for meeting those needs.[2]

In addition to the use of an independent consultant, the Board's project plan created a "Project Coordination Team" (PCT) consisting of representatives of the University of Washington, State Board for Community and Technical Colleges, Shoreline Community College, and the Office of Financial Management.[3] The purpose of the PCT was to provide expert program consultation and advice to the independent consultant and HECB staff. The PCT met on seven occasions over the course of the study project.

---

[1] See: Appendix A, Summary and Text of Sections 106, 716, and 745 of the 1993-1995 Capital Appropriations Act.

[2] The Consultant's final report, An Evaluation of Alternative Organizational Models for Meeting the Higher Education and Work Force Training Needs of the North King and South Snohomish County Area, MGT of America, Inc., October 15, 1993, was submitted to the HECB on October 15, 1993. In the remainder of this report, the MGT document is referred to/referenced as the "MGT final report."

[3] See: Appendix B, Members of the Project Coordination Team.

At these meetings, the PCT reviewed the consultant's study plan, provided program and technical information concerning enrollment needs, operating and capital cost estimates, and offered assessments of the consultant's preliminary and final evaluation of the alternative organizational models and site feasibility findings. Additionally, following the completion of the consultant's study, the PCT provided HECB staff with institutional responses and positions to the MGT recommendations.

The third component of the Board's project plan was the solicitation and consideration of public comment concerning the consultant's findings and recommendations. To obtain this information, HECB staff conducted a public forum on September 2, 1993 in Bothell. At this meeting, interested parties were asked to comment on the consultant's report of preliminary findings and recommendations. In addition to the forum, a public hearing on the consultant's final report was held at Lake Washington Technical College on October 27, 1993. The proceedings of both public meetings were recorded and reviewed in the preparation of the staff recommendations.[4]

In arriving at the recommendations offered in this report, staff first review the legislative background of the Campus Planning Study. This review is followed by a summary and staff analysis of the consultant's major findings and recommendations. This discussion incorporates comments from the PCT and information provided at the public forum and the public hearing. Staff recommendations are then presented with a discussion of the rationale underlying these proposed actions.

II. Policy Context of the Campus Planning Study

In 1989 and 1991, the state Legislature established and reaffirmed state policy concerning the expansion of lower and upper division and graduate level access opportunities in the state's urban areas. Specifically, the 1989 Legislature authorized creation of four branch campuses and appropriated funds for their planning and development.[5] As part of the authorization, the University of Washington was designated the responsible institution for

---

[4] Appendix C, Transcripts of the September 2, 1993 "Public Forum," and the October 27, 1993 "Public Hearing," are on file in the HECB office and available upon request.

[5] Engrossed Senate Bill 6095 (amending 28B RCW), and Section 106, Chapter 12, Laws of 1989.

a branch campus to be established in the Bothell-Woodinville area. In 1991, the Legislature continued its support for the expanded access initiatives by appropriating additional physical development funds for the branch campuses and authorizing planning funds for a new community college in the north Lake Washington area.[6]

In response to the 1989 and 1991 authorizations by the Legislature, a permanent site for the UW Bothell branch campus was selected (Wellington Hills), and a preliminary Environmental Impact Study and master plan for the Bothell campus was developed and completed.[7] [8] Additionally, the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges (SBCTC) proceeded with a siting study for the new community college. This study resulted in the designation of the Truly Farm site as the preferred location for the new college.

Subsequent to these planning activities and siting decisions, two events occurred concerning the delivery of postsecondary programs in the north King and south Snohomish Counties area which are germane to the 1993 Legislature's directives concerning the conduct of the Campus Planning Study. First, on June 22, 1992, legislative members held a meeting to review plans and progress of the UW Bothell branch campus and new community college. At this meeting, attended by legislators, OFM, HECB, UW and WSU staff, legislative members expressed an interest in exploring the potential benefits of collocating the two institutions.[9]

In response to this interest the SBCTC, which had been appropriated funds in the 1991-1993 capital budget to conduct a "predesign study" for the new community college, modified the scope of that study to include a comparative cost analysis of the collocation and separate campus alternatives. That study, conducted in cooperation with the University of Washington, concluded that collocation at the Wellington Hills site in facilities developed

---

[6] Sections 6(4) and 44(71), Chapter 14, Laws of 1991.

[7] See: Appendix D, Site Selection for Bothell/Woodinville Area Branch Campus, HECB staff report, December 12, 1990.

[8] See: Appendix E, Transcript of December 12, 1990 HECB Action on Bothell Campus Site Selection.

[9] Earlier HECB reports used the term "co-location" to mean the siting of two institutions at the same location. This report uses the accepted spelling "collocation" (Webster).

pursuant to the University of Washington's master plan and design standards was programmatically feasible for a ten year period. The study also concluded that marginal (4%) savings would accrue from the "temporary" collocation of the two institutions.[10]

The second action contributing to the conduct of the Campus Planning Study resulted from Governor Gardner's budget proposal for the 1993-95 biennium. Submitted to the Legislature in December, 1992, the Gardner budget called for the creation of a new four-year comprehensive university (Cascade State University).[11] This proposal argued that the creation of a new comprehensive state university would be less expensive than the creation of two separate campuses, and would meet the educational needs of the area as well, or perhaps better, than the new community college and branch campus. Governor Gardner proposed that the new university be located at either the Truly Farm or Wellington Hills sites.

Concurrent with his proposal for the new comprehensive university, Governor Gardner's capital budget included a proposed appropriation to the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges to "acquire property for a new community college."[12] This proposal contained proviso language which specified that if Cascade State University was approved by the 1993 Legislature, then funds appropriated under the section would be used for Cascade State University. Alternatively, the proviso language stipulated that if the new university was not approved, "the higher education coordinating board is directed to study and make recommendations ... about meeting the academic needs of the Bothell-Woodinville area with a single higher education institution and a single governance structure."

While the 1993 Legislature did not support the creation of a new comprehensive university, it did adopt three sections of the capital budget which carried forward Governor Gardner's proposal to re-examine alternative ways of meeting the higher education and work

---

[10] Final Report: New Community Pre-Design Study, NBBJ, Seattle, Washington, November 13, 1992.

[11] See: Appendix F, Governor Gardner's Proposal for Cascade State University.

[12] See Section 810 of the Gardner Capital Budget (Z-0457.1/93) in Appendix F.

force training needs of the study area.[13] The legislative intent of these three sections, summarized below, was reviewed with the Board at its May, 1993 meeting.[14] At that meeting, staff advised the Board that differences existed between House and Senate members over the interpretation of the intent of these sections.

The central issue of disagreement concerned the "linkage" of the findings of the Campus Planning Study to further expenditure of (appropriated) funds for physical development of the Bothell branch campus and the purchase of property for a new institution of higher education.[15] Some members felt that the intent of the language was to defer any further expenditures and commitments pending the outcome of the study and the Board's determination of a preferred organizational model. This interpretation noted that the language of the sections required expenditures to be consistent with the recommendations of the HECB and that the term "recommendations" meant the findings and recommendations of the Campus Planning Study.

Other legislators opined that the adopted language of the sections did not preclude additional expenditures pending the outcome of the Campus Planning Study. This position noted that the adopted language reflected substantive revisions to earlier drafts which contained explicit references to the findings and recommendations of the Campus Planning Study. Consequently, in the opinion of some members, further expenditures could be made before the Board adopted its recommendations on the Campus Planning Study if such expenditures were consistent with earlier recommendations of the HECB concerning the development of the branch campus and acquisition of property for a new community college.

The policy of the executive branch with respect to the performance of these sections was to employ the more narrow or restrictive interpretation of legislative intent. Consequently, the Office of Financial Management deferred the allotment of funds for the development of the Wellington Hills site pending the recommendations of the HECB.

---

[13] See Appendix A.

[14] See: Appendix G, North King/South Snohomish Counties Campus Planning Study & Related Budget Proviso, HECB, May 26, 1993.

[15] As noted in Appendix G, the appropriation for a new institution of higher education had, in earlier versions of this section, been titled "Acquire Property for a New Community College."

In summary, staff believe that the underlying policy issue of the Campus Planning Study deals little, if at all, with the determination of sufficient unmet need to warrant expanded access in the north King and south Snohomish Counties area. Rather, given a recognized need for expanded postsecondary services, the question for consideration and resolution is:

> ***Should the state proceed with plans to construct a permanent UW Bothell branch campus at the Wellington Hills site and create a new and separate community college in the same geographic area, or, should an alternative method and/or site for meeting the postsecondary educational needs of the area be considered by the executive and legislature?***

III. Review and Analysis of Consultant's Findings and Recommendations

Based on its analysis, MGT of America concludes that an alternative to the present plans for a separate branch campus and community college is warranted. Specifically, the six recommendations offered by MGT may be summarized as a "permanent" collocation model wherein each institution would retain separate governance structures but would provide programs in facilities "owned" by a local agency or state agency other than the institutions. While each institution would have some control over some facilities, MGT proposes that the local agency manage and have control over "common" functions (e.g., food service, parking, general purpose classrooms). Under this model, MGT also proposes that the existing advisory committees in the area be merged into one advisory/planning group. To implement its recommended model, MGT recommends that the HECB promulgate specific operational policies for the operation/administration of the campus.

These recommendations followed from the consultant's findings concerning the study area's postsecondary needs and the comparative programmatic, cost, and site characteristics of the alternative organizational models considered.[16] These findings are summarized and discussed below.

---

[16] See: Appendix H, Description of Study Area, Alternative Organizational Models, and Evaluation Matrix Used by MGT of America.

Determination of Enrollment Needs

As discussed earlier, the Campus Planning Study is concerned with determining the best method of meeting unmet need in the study area. While there is general consensus that the current service level of postsecondary programs is insufficient with respect to current and future need, the consultant was asked to verify and update the estimate of unmet need. Based on its analysis, MGT concluded that if enrollments followed the current HECB and SBCTC participation rate goals, the following student Full Time Equivalent (FTE) levels would exceed the existing and planned capacity of area institutions in the time periods indicated below.[17]

Estimate of Unmet Need by Level and Year

Level	1995	2000	2005	2010
Basic Skills	117	204	222	255
Workforce Training	369	1124	978	1008
Lower Division Academic	1044	2425	2584	2954
Subtotal	**1530**	**3753**	**3784**	**4217**
Upper Division	409	1165	2538	3746
Graduate/Professional	228	693	1333	1961
Subtotal	**637**	**1858**	**3871**	**5707**
Total	**2167**	**5611**	**7665**	**9924**

Staff believe the importance of these data is the confirmation that expanded access for all levels is needed in the study area if participation goals are to be met. Staff also note that participation rate based definitions of "need" do not necessarily reflect the level of demand that will occur in response to future enrollment opportunity. In this

[17] See: MGT Final Report, pp. 21-31.

regard, staff concur with the institutional responses that future enrollment demand will probably exceed these estimates of need.[18]

Assessment of Community Attitudes

Notwithstanding the different opinions of legislative members over the intent of the Campus Planning Study directive, one clear and consistently expressed expectation was that the study should actively solicit and consider community views in the formulation of a recommended organizational model. Accordingly, the Request for Proposal issued by the HECB for consultant services emphasized the need and importance of community participation in the study project. Specifically, the RFP stated:

> "Proposals should include, as part of the study methodology, provisions and procedures for obtaining community participation in the conduct of the study. The description of such methods should include a discussion of how the attitudes and opinions of affected citizens will be incorporated in the comparison of the alternative organizational models."[19]

In responding to this contractual requirement, MGT developed and carried out a study work plan which assigned a substantial amount of the consultant's work effort to the identification and assessment of community opinions. Utilizing a variety of techniques, including structured telephone interviews, student focus groups, personal interviews, town hall meetings, meetings with faculty and advisory committees, MGT concluded that:

> "... it (is) evident that the consensus of those contacted strongly favor both a new community college and the development of a branch campus of the

---

[18] See: Appendix I, UW, SBCTC, OFM Comments/Responses to MGT Findings and Recommendations.

[19] Request for Proposals: Evaluation of Alternative Organizational Models for Meeting the Higher Education and Work Force Training Needs of the North King and South Snohomish Counties Area of Washington State, HECB, May 24, 1993.

> University of Washington. The issue of whether the two should be separately located or collocated ... (is) of lesser importance than proceeding rapidly with development."[20]

Staff and the consultant recognize that the community opinion information obtained is not representative of all residents of the study area. However, while the individuals contacted through the various surveys and interviews did not purport to constitute a representative sampling of study area residents, it seems reasonable to conclude that the individuals participating in the study do offer a representation of higher education interests in the study area. In this regard, staff note that testimony provided at the September 2, 1993 public forum and the October 27, 1993 public hearing strongly supports MGT's interpretation of the general sentiment of these interested parties.

Comparative Evaluation of Alternative Models

At the onset of the study, MGT identified five conceptual academic paradigms for expanded postsecondary services in the study area.[21] The five program concepts, or "delivery options" were,

1. A new community college and an upper division/graduate university,

2. A new community college and a lower and upper division/graduate university,

3. A lower and upper division/graduate university as the only institution,

4. No new institutions; expand capacity at existing institutions and maintain UW Bothell at Fall 1993 enrollment levels,

5. Other models that could be defined in the course of the study.

---

[20] MGT final report, p. 20.

[21] All five options assume the expansion of Lake Washington Technical College.

These conceptual delivery options were then further refined and differentiated by MGT on the factors of: (1) Governance Structure, (2) Program Mission, and (3) Shared or Separate Siting. This led to a total of 14 possible alternative organizational models listed below.

A New Community College Governed by a Board of Trustees, and An Upper Division/Graduate Branch Governed by:

The University of Washington
Separately Located from the New Community College, or
Collocated with the Community College, or

An Existing Comprehensive University
Separately Located from the New Community College, or
Collocated with the Community College, or

A New Comprehensive University
Separately Located from the New Community College, or
Collocated with the Community College.

A New Community College Governed by a Board of Trustees and A Lower and Upper Division/Graduate University Governed by:

The University of Washington, or
An Existing Comprehensive University, or
A New Comprehensive University.

A Lower and Upper Division/Graduate University Governed by:

The University of Washington, or
An Existing Comprehensive University, or
A New Comprehensive University.

No New Institutions - Expand Capacity at Existing Institutions and Maintain UW Bothell at Fall 1993 Enrollment Levels.

Other Models that Could Be Defined in the Course of the Study.

As a first step in the evaluation of the alternatives, MGT conducted a threshold analysis to identify which of the above 14 models represented meaningful and distinct alternative methods of program delivery. The decision rules of the analysis were that only those models which: (a) represented a viable program delivery option related to area needs, (b) a role and mission related to area needs but unique from other models, and (c) based on the consultant's professional experience, had an acceptable likelihood of successful implementation, would be considered for further evaluation.

These decision rules led to exclusion of the following alternatives from further consideration:

- The two models which called for an existing comprehensive university to develop a branch campus. MGT concluded that existing legislative and HECB direction regarding the instructional (non research) mission of the UW and WSU branch campuses precluded, by definition, a meaningful distinction between the UW branch and that of a comprehensive institution.

- The two models that called for collocation of two institutions that would both offer lower division academic programming, since the presumed student access advantages of collocation would be moot.

- The two models that would create a comprehensive university without a lower division based on the less-than-successful experience that other states have encountered with that type of institution.

In addition to these exclusions, MGT identified a new model that satisfied the conditions of the threshold analysis. Termed the "Broker" model, this alternative envisioned the creation of a local board that would own and manage campus facilities and would "purchase" programs from existing institutions.

The alternatives left for final comparative evaluation consisted of:

- A separately located new community college and an upper division/graduate branch of the University of Washington;

- A collocated new community college and an upper division/graduate branch of the University of Washington;
- A separately located new community college and a new four-year plus graduate comprehensive university;
- A separately located new community college and a new four-year plus graduate university governed by the University of Washington;
- A four-year plus graduate branch of the University of Washington as the only new institution;
- A new four-year plus graduate comprehensive university as the only new institution;
- Maintain UW/Bothell branch at October 1993 level and expand capacity at Shoreline and Edmonds Community Colleges, Lake Washington Technical College and the University of Washington main campus;
- A new state funded campus and board to broker educational services purchased from the University of Washington, area community colleges, Lake Washington Technical College and other institutions as needed.

These alternatives were evaluated by MGT on 18 criteria measuring programmatic and cost factors in the five areas listed below.[22] The evaluation was conducted in four time periods for each alternative since certain models may be viable for a limited period of time and others may only be considered viable over an extended time-frame.[23]

---

[22] See MGT final report, pp. 54-66, for a detailed discussion of the criteria weights and scoring procedure used by the consultant.

[23] The four time periods used by MGT were: The near term, approximating 1995-97; the mid term, approximating 2005-2007; the long term, approximating 2010 and, in certain instances, the period beyond 2010.

Ability to Meet Area Postsecondary Education Needs
Ability to Address Academic Planning Concerns
Ability to Provide Accessibility of Educational Opportunities
Ability to Meet Fiscal Concerns
Availability of Acceptable Site(s)

Based on its analysis, MGT concluded that the collocation of a new community college and an upper division/graduate branch of the University of Washington was the preferred organizational alternative. Among the reasons for this finding, MGT cited that, "in addition to fully meeting area needs and providing outstanding access to educational opportunities, the collocated (sic) community college and branch campus ...":[24]

- Has "the potential to support the most effective student progression and (thus provide) a greater ability to continue the Board's policy in support of a 2 + 2 approach to meeting needs ..."[25]

- Provides "an alternative response to meeting the (lower division) course needs of upper division students and thereby helps maintain a clear definition of institutional role."[26]

- Offers "the potential for savings in capital costs ... (T)hrough avoiding duplication of shared facilities, such as auditoria, food service, physical education, and plant services, plus improved scheduling efficiency, capital construction costs can be kept approximately 10 percent below the separately located alternative."[27]

(emphases added)

---

[24] "Compendium of Findings and Recommendations," MGT of America, October 28, 1993.

[25] "Compendium..." p. 6.

[26] "Compendium..." p. 7.

[27] "Compendium..." p. 6.

Staff concur with the conclusions of MGT concerning the potential benefits of a collocated community college and UW branch campus. Staff believe it important to recognize that the anticipated benefits of such an arrangement follow from postulated constructs and comparisons. While not discounting the judgments leading to the conclusions, staff believe it is important to acknowledge several elements of the underlying premise of the "collocation hypothesis".

First, the collocation model presumes a *de facto* compatibility between the values inherent in the role and mission of the participating institutions. Staff believe that collocation will require a recognition and reconciliation of the "open door" philosophy of the community colleges and the "selective" access values of the university. Staff do not believe, though, that the reconciliation of these different values necessarily means changing institutional philosophy or subordinating one set of standards and beliefs. Rather, staff feel that role and mission compatibility can result from a mutual respect for these different philosophies and a campus "compact" which recognizes and articulates this respect.

A second assumption of the collocation model, and related to the first, is the participants' ability to define precisely and establish the functional operating roles for managing campus facilities and activities. While MGT has recommended the creation of a local agency to "own" the campus and manage the operation of shared or common spaces, staff believe that the introduction of a new, third party, into the collocation "relationship" would be, at the onset of the relationship, premature. Rather, staff believe the participants should review the alternatives for operations management, among them a third party, and as part of the "campus compact", determine and define the policies and procedures for campus administration.

A third and important premise underlying the collocation model concerns assumptions about the longevity of the collocation. MGT's findings are presented in the context of a "permanent" collocation plan. This approach is different than that assumed by the UW and SBCTC in their earlier study of collocation feasibility. That study assumed a "temporary" collocation (ten years).

Staff believe that either adjective (temporary or permanent) is premature and ignores the future opportunity/necessity to evaluate the fiscal and programmatic accomplishments of the collocation model. Specifically, the collocation model is an "optimiza-

tion" hypothesis which holds that added program value is attainable at lower capital costs.

While staff do not now know the empirical validity of this theory, the state's current fiscal climate and the consultant's analysis generate, in the opinion of staff, sufficient justification to try the concept. If it works, then the model can and should continue in time to do so. Alternatively, if it does not work, it can change.[28] In this regard, staff opine that the adjective before collocation may never be fixed, or if one is used, it will be done so after the fact.

Site Feasibility Assessment

As part of the overall study, MGT, in consultation with Johnson Architecture/Planning, conducted an assessment of the siting feasibility of the alternative organizational models. The purpose of this assessment was to determine which sites known to be available in the study area could adequately support the program of each of the alternative organizational models.

The assessment was designed as a threshold analysis using criteria limited to program suitability (e.g., location, transportation access, size) and general development potential (i.e., site characteristics, compliance with Growth Management Act). Three sites were deemed feasible for the recommended collocation alternative.[29] [30] These are as follows:

- Montevilla
- Truly Farm
- Wellington Hills

---

[28] Staff further discuss the implementation, evaluation criteria, and development possibilities of the collocation model in Section V, Staff Recommendations.

[29] See: Appendix J, Site Summary: Montevilla, Truly Farm, Wellington Hills.

[30] See MGT final report, Site Feasibility Assessment, for a discussion of assessment methodology and site data.

While found to meet minimum program suitability criteria, various factors or issues are present for each of the sites which raise concerns regarding the actual purchase/development potential. These issues, and site information not available at the time of the MGT final report, are discussed below.

Montevilla

The cost of the Montevilla site is estimated between $25 and $30 million. A portion of this site is known as the Fortin Farm properties, which was considered by the UW and the HECB in the selection of a permanent site for the Bothell branch campus (Wellington Hills). At that time, the cost of the Fortin Farm site was considered prohibitive.

Staff acknowledge the closeness of the site to population and transportation centers, and feel that this central location accounts for the site's prime value. In view of the probable cost of this site, and assuming the availability of other sites that adequately support the collocated campus, staff do not believe that the purchase of this property can be considered a viable option.

Truly Farm

This site was considered by the University of Washington during the site selection process for the branch campus (1989-90). In the university's process, a Siting Advisory Committee identified 31 possible sites. From that inventory five sites were, in September 1989, chosen for final consideration. Truly Farm was one of the five finalists. Due to then recent events concerning the flooding of Truly Farm and concerns with the unknown impacts of wetlands requirements, the Truly Farm site was not one of three sites recommended to the Regents and was not considered by the HECB in its selection of the Wellington Hills campus.[31]

As noted above, a primary concern with Truly Farm at the time of the branch campus site selection dealt with observed flooding problems on the site. Specifically, during the fall of 1989, the time period of the branch campus site selection process,

[31] See: Appendix D, Site Selection for Bothell/Woodinville Area Branch Campus, HECB staff report, December 12, 1990.

significant rainfall in central/northwestern Washington caused considerable flooding in Snohomish and Whatcom Counties. As was the case with many properties, a system of levies at the Truly Farm provided inadequate protection against this significant flood condition.

In late 1991, the SBCTC began its siting study for the new community college in the north Lake Washington area. Truly Farm was identified as one of 26 possible sites and was ultimately selected by the SBCTC as the preferred site for the new college.[32]

This selection was based on criteria which included site accessibility, compliance with Growth Management Act boundaries, proximity to the service area population, and transit access. Additionally, the site evaluation criteria included the development capacity or potential of the site with respect to soils conditions, flood plain determination, and wetlands protection.

In conducting the site assessment, the SBCTC and its consultant (Johnson Architecture/Planning) took into consideration the need to raise the elevation of the berms along North Creek which runs through the site. This action requires a Shoreline Substantial Development and Conditional Use Permit from the City of Bothell. The need for this was demonstrated during the 1989 storm when significant storm water run-off from (then recently) commercially developed up-stream properties in Snohomish County caused the volume of water flow in North Creek to exceed the capacity of the levies to accommodate water flow during a 100 year flood event. In short, based on its technical evaluation, the SBCTC concluded that development at the preferred site was feasible given the correction of the berm elevation deficiencies.

At about the same time of the SBCTC site study, the owner of Truly Farm applied and was granted a Substantial Development Permit to raise the berms along North Creek. Following the City of Bothell's approval of the requested Substantial Development Permit, two actions occurred affecting the raising of the berms. The first action concerns an appeal filed with the State Shoreline Hearings Board (SSHB)

---

[32] The estimated purchase price of the Truly Farm site was approximately $18 to $19 million. That estimated cost range does not reflect any cost impacts associated with the final wetlands determination now pending before the U.S. Corps of Engineers.

regarding the permit issued by the city.[33] This matter, which is currently pending before the SSHB, involves procedural compliance over the issuance of the Substantial Development Permit. Specifically, the claimants contend that the permit should not have been issued since it was not in furtherance of an approved development plan for the property. The City of Bothell and Mr. Truly argue that the action to raise the berms is solely for flood protection and, consequently, should not be considered as part of a development plan and action.

With respect to the second action, the Federal Emergency Management Agency revised its 100-year flood event flow estimate for North Creek after the city's issuance of the Substantial Development Permit to raise the berms to a specified height. The revised estimate, which forecasts a water flow 2.5 times greater than the capacity of the existing berms, is greater than the estimate used by the owner when filing his application for the permit to raise the berms. Consequently, the owner has subsequently filed a modified application to further increase the berm height.

The parties to the appeal before the State Shoreline Hearings Board have agreed to have the matter before the SSHB returned to the City of Bothell for action on the revised permit application. If the city approves the application, then the matter will be returned to the SSHB for resolution. If the appeal is denied, the owner will be allowed to correct the berm deficiencies. If the appeal is upheld, the Substantial Development Permit will be deemed invalid. In this case, the City of Bothell has advised staff that "... such a denial is not a precedent nor does it preclude an application to modify the berms in accordance with an approved development plan (prepared) by the State or any other party..." (including the current owner).[34]

Another action concerning the Truly property was recently resolved in Thurston Count Superior Court. Specifically, in Washington Environmental Council and Bothell Neighborhood Association v Department of Ecology and Truly, the court found that the (existing) Urban Special Management classification of the Truly Farm

---

[33] Save a Valuable Environment and Department of Ecology v Truly and the City of Bothell

[34] Letter from John Wallace, Office of the City Attorney, City of Bothell, October 14, 1993.

property was properly granted by the City of Bothell and no violations of the Administrative Procedures Act in related actions occurred.

The Urban Special Management (USM) classification was granted at the time of the city's annexation of the property and was part of an agreement between the property's owner, the City of Bothell, and the Department of Ecology. Under this agreement, the property would receive the USM classification, thus allowing the owner to sell the property for a shopping center development project, with the stipulation that a certain amount of the property would not be developed. This stipulation provided that of the total property, an aggregate 50 acres could be developed with impervious surfaces for building footprints or parking facilities. Fifteen acres were to be protected for the North Creek corridor, 12 acres could be developed for roads, and 25 acres were to open landscaped areas between or adjacent to site improvements.

Using the above criteria, and the most recent determination of wetlands on the Truly property, HECB staff obtained an updated analysis of the development feasibility of Truly Farm.[35] The purpose of this analysis, conducted by NBBJ of Seattle, was to determine, in view of the new information about Truly Farm, the capacity of the site to accommodate the collocation model.

NBBJ conducted its analysis on the basis of the preliminary wetlands determination provided by Evans and Associates, and preliminary information provided by OTAK & Associates concerning hydrological characteristics of the site.[36] Based on these sources, NBBJ concluded that development at the site was programmatically and financially feasible.[37] Similarly, the hydrological survey conducted by OTAK

---

[35] Preliminary Wet Lands Determination: Truly Farm - Bothell, Washington, David Evans and Associates, Bellevue, Washington. April 28, 1993.

[36] The OTAK study was conducted for OFM concurrent with the conduct of the Campus Planning Study. This study involves a hydrological survey of the Truly Farm as required in Section 106 of the Capital Appropriations Act (see Appendix A of this report). The language of this section was adopted in response to the legislative and executive concerns over the 1989 flooding at Truly Farm.

[37] See Appendix K, Test of Fit for Co-location of CC and UWBC on Truly Farm Site, NBBJ, Seattle, October 27, 1993.

concluded that no "fatal flaws" exist with respect to the development capacity of the site. However, the OTAK study recognized that the wetland areas on the site remain to be officially defined by the Corps of Engineers. As noted by both OTAK and NBBJ, if this determination includes areas of the site not "mapped" in the Evans study as wetlands, then further analysis of the site's capacity to accommodate a campus serving 9,900 student FTE will be required. Additionally, OTAK concluded that development costs would be higher at the site than would exist if these preservation requirements were not present.

The OTAK conclusions are supportive and consistent with the findings of the development feasibility and cost analysis provided by NBBJ. Specifically, NBBJ concluded that the Truly Farm site is "not atypical in site development constraints (i.e.,wetlands and steep slopes). Much of the northeast King County/Snohomish Counties area has these conditions and the large, easier, and less costly to develop sites have already been developed."[38] (emphasis added)

Additionally, NBBJ estimates that the capital cost of developing a collocated campus on the Truly Farm site is, under the most constrained or "worst-case" scenario, approximately $140 million (exclusive of land and soft costs). While the MGT cost estimate for development of separate campuses ($145 million) is higher than the updated collocation estimate, the MGT estimate is **not comparable** to the NBBJ estimate because it did not incorporate the building cost impact of any site specific environmental mitigation requirements for either Truly Farm or Wellington Hills.[39]

In summary, staff conclude that, in view of:

1. The OTAK and NBBJ findings summarized above,
2. The favorable ruling in Washington Environmental Council and Bothell Neighborhood Association v Department of Ecology and Truly,
3. The non-preclusionary nature of any ruling in Save a Valuable Environment and Department of Ecology v Truly and the City of Bothell relative to the

[38] See: Appendix K, p. 3.

[39] These factors would increase the cost of the MGT estimates for separate development, thus increasing the capital savings of the collocation model.

current or future owners ability to seek and the City of Bothell's authority to grant a Substantial Development Permit, and

4. The location of Truly Farm within the Urban Growth Area of King County,

the Truly Farm property is a viable option for the location of the collocated campus. Staff recognize that additional development and property acquisition cost analyses are required for this or any other viable site prior to an acquisition decision.

Wellington Hills

As noted above, the Wellington Hills site was selected in 1989 by the university regents and the HECB as the permanent site for the university's Bothell-Woodinville branch campus. The two other sites considered by the regents and the HECB in the final selection process were Fortin Farm and Crystal Lake.

Fortin Farm was not selected because of its cost (approximately $30 million). The site was recognized by HECB staff, however, as offering good accessibility and superior proximity to support services than either Wellington Hills or Crystal Lake.[40] Additionally, Fortin Farm was recognized as the only site found to be consistent with local development policies, and the then recently established proposed Growth Management boundaries of Snohomish County.

Crystal Lake was not selected because of poor accessibility, inconsistency with local development policies, and strong community opposition to development. As noted earlier, this site was outside of the then proposed Growth Management boundaries of Snohomish County.

As is indicated in the transcript of the HECB proceedings concerning the selection of the permanent site for the Bothell branch campus, the selection of Wellington Hills was made in the context of the above two exclusions.[41] Specifically, one site (Fortin Farm), offering good accessibility and compliance with local planning policies, could

---

[40] See: Appendix D, Site Selection for Bothell/Woodinville Area Branch Campus, HECB staff report, December 12, 1990.

[41] See: Appendix E, Transcript of December 12, 1990 HECB Action on Bothell Campus Site Selection.

not be chosen because of its cost. The other site lacked access and community willingness to have a college campus as a neighbor.

Wellington Hills was selected because it was accessible and was affordable. Additionally, this site did not elicit the same degree of community opposition as found with Crystal Lake. Additionally, while it was known that the Wellington Hills site was beyond the then established proposed Growth Management boundaries of Snohomish County, the university and the HECB recognized that the growth boundaries were not "final" and that opportunities were available to influence the final determination of the urban growth area with the county.

Additionally, it should be noted that at the time of the university's and HECB selection of Wellington Hills, the Growth Management Act was "new law" and many statutory provisions remained in need of operational definition prior to application. Among these areas of needed clarification were the definition and procedures for the "Siting of Essential Public Facilities."

Specifically, at the time of selecting Wellington Hills there was a general question among UW and HECB staff and counsel as to whether siting "essential public facilities" included university campuses, and if such essential facilities could be sited beyond urban growth boundaries. The following excerpt from the HECB site selection testimony illustrates these questions and uncertainties:

> **David Tang** (HECB Member): ... is there any question that development on any of the three sites would not comply with the Growth Management policies and restrictions under the Act?
>
> **Rian Durkan** (Special Counsel to the university): ... There has been much discussion, much debate, as to whether the sites comply with HB 2929 (Growth Management Act). It's my view that we don't know a specific answer to that because the Growth Management Act is a moving target at this point ... At this point Snohomish County has indicated to us that SR 9 is the proposed Urban Growth Boundary. N-6 (Wellington Hills) and the Crystal Lake site, N-5, would both be outside the boundary if that was adopted. Yet, what we don't know is whether that will, in fact, be the final location ...

> Section 15 of the Act directs the county ... to work with the state toward locating public facilities ... We also don't know what uses would be permitted outside of the urban growth boundary ... The issue of whether the state has to comply with the local land use plans that are adopted is also an open question.

Nearly three years have now passed since the December 1990 HECB action to select Wellington Hills. Many of the unresolved issues associated with that action have subsequently been clarified. Specifically,

1. Snohomish County did formally adopt SR 9 as the easterly growth management boundary. This boundary was recently (10/93) reaffirmed in the county's adoption of the official Interim Growth Plan. This action was taken in response to RCW 36.70A.110(1) which states:

> "Each county that is required to adopt a comprehensive land use plan ... shall designate an urban growth area or areas within which urban growth shall be encouraged and outside of which growth can only occur if it is not urban in nature."[42] (emphasis added)

2. All state facilities have been defined by OFM as essential public facilities, and Snohomish County has adopted a procedure for the siting of essential public facilities in a manner consistent with its area plan.[43]

3. State agencies are now statutorily required to comply with the local plans. Specifically, RCW 36.70A.103 (amending the Growth Management Act [1991] sp.s. c 32,4) states:

> "State agencies shall comply with the local comprehensive plans and development regulations and amendments thereto adopted pursuant to this chapter."

---

[42] The term "urban in nature" refers to "growth that makes intensive use of land for the location of buildings, structures, and impermeable surfaces..."(RCW 36.70.A.030(14).

[43] See: 1993-1995 Capital Budget Instructions, Office of Financial Management, 1992.

4. Cities and towns are now prohibited by law from annexing any area beyond a urban growth boundary.[44] Specifically, RCW 35.13.005 and 35A.14.005 state:

> "No city or town located in a county in which urban growth areas have been designated under RCW 36.70A.110 may annex territory beyond an urban growth area."

5. The Legislature has adopted explicit limitations over authority of the state to appeal the actions of a county or city concerning the provisions of the Growth Management Act. Specifically, RCW 36.70A.310 states:

> "A request for review by the state to a growth planning hearings board may be made only by the governor, or with the governor's consent the head of an agency, or by the commissioner of public lands as relating to public trust lands, for the review of whether: (1) A county or city ... has failed to adopt a comprehensive plan or development regulations, or county-wide planning policies within the time limits established by this chapter; or (2) a county or city ... has adopted a comprehensive plan, development regulation, or county-wide planning policies, that are not in compliance with the requirements of this chapter." (emphasis added)

6. The Legislature has explicitly established the presumption of validity of the plans and regulations adopted by counties and cities pursuant to the Growth Management Act. RCW 36.70A.320 states:

> "Comprehensive plans and development regulations, and amendments thereto, adopted under this chapter are presumed valid upon adoption. In any petition under this chapter, the (growth planning hearings) board, after full consideration of the petition, shall determine whether there is compliance with the requirements of this chapter. In making its determination, the board shall consider the criteria adopted (under this chapter). The board shall find compliance unless it finds by a

[44] This issue was raised subsequent to the selection of Wellington Hills and concerned the desire of the City of Woodinville to annex the Wellington Hills site and thereby place it within the urban growth boundary of King County.

preponderance of the evidence that the state agency, county, or city erroneously interpreted or applied this chapter". (emphasis added)

In view of these provisions of state law and county policy enacted following the selection of the Wellington Hills site, staff conclude that ability to secure a Conditional Use Permit to allow construction of a university campus at the Wellington Hills site is, under current law and policy, improbable, if not prohibited. Further, staff note that the future likelihood of construction being permitted at Wellington Hills is undeterminable and such speculation on the part of staff would be based upon conjecture over future events and would not constitute a valid basis for a staff recommendation.

Consequently, staff do not believe that the Wellington Hills site can now be considered a viable option for the siting of a higher education campus. In arriving at this conclusion, staff feel it important to note that, in the opinion of staff, the decision to select Wellington Hills as the site for the UW branch campus was a choice based on then available information which supported the site decision. Specifically, that decision resulted from a systematic process for site evaluation and was based on accurate information about the characteristics of the three final sites. Additionally, while the decision was made in view of uncertainties over the implications of the (then) new Growth Management Act, staff do not believe that the manner in which these questions would ultimately be resolved through legislation and county policy could have been anticipated at the time of the December, 1990 decision to select Wellington Hills.

IV. Assessment of Consultant's Recommendations

The staff response and comments to the recommendations offered by MGT are provided below. Additionally, responses and comments from the University of Washington, State Board for Community and Technical Colleges, Shoreline Community College, and the Office of Financial management are provided (Agency Comments). Where applicable, staff also summarize views and opinions expressed at the September 2, 1993 public forum and the October 27, 1993 public hearing.

MGT Recommendation #1: *We recommend that the Board recommend to the Legislature that a new community college be formed and that development plans should begin in conjunction with development plans for a collocated upper division and graduate branch campus of the University of Washington (the UW-Bothell).*

Staff Analysis and Comments: Staff concur with the consultant's recommendation to proceed with planning the development of a collocated community college and upper division and graduate branch of the University of Washington. Staff also concur with the Agency Comments provided below.

Agency Comments:[45] The participating institutions and the Office of Financial Management are supportive of the collocation recommendation. The institutions' support is based on two assumptions. First, that a mutually acceptable plan or "compact" for the development and operations of the campus can be perfected. Secondly, that state policy makers recognize the possibility that at some point in the future, enrollment growth, changes in program and offerings, or other logistical matters may necessitate the relocation, in whole or in part, of one of the participants.

Public Hearing Comments: There appears to exist general support for the collocation recommendation. This support is understood within the context of the widely held and expressed desire to "see something happen now".

MGT Recommendation #2: *We recommend that the campus be planned to accommodate the enrollment levels associated with the goals of the HECB and SBCTC. In 2010 this would amount to 9,900 FTE students. Based on projected age group population trends through 2020, this level should be sufficient for the next 25 years.*

Staff Analysis and Comments: Staff concur with the consultant's recommendation. Staff note that the while the recommendation refers to an ultimate "build-out" capacity for 9,900 student FTE, the recommendation proposes that the campus be planned to accommodate incremental enrollment levels per HECB and SBCTC enrollment goals. Accordingly, staff conclude that the development plan for the campus will be long

---

[45] See: Appendix I, UW, SBCTC, OFM Comments/Responses to MGT Findings and Recommendations.

term in nature and will consist of different phases of development reflecting the incremental growth of student enrollment levels over time.

Agency Comments: The participating institutions and the Office of Financial Management concur with the recommendation. Both institutions also feel that eventual enrollment demand for basic skills, workforce training, lower and upper division and graduate/professional programs in the north King and south Snohomish Counties area will in the long term exceed the 9,900 student FTE build-out capacity recommended by MGT for the collocated campus in the year 2010. Consequently, institutions feel that eventual, long-term, enrollment demand will justify additional higher education programs in the area requiring new sites and facilities. Staff concur with this conclusion.

MGT Recommendation #3: *We recognize that the collocated model requires a larger site than the separately located approach and that available sites do not provide surplus capacity. If actual site acquisition should indicate that developable acres are insufficient to accommodate the full 9,900 FTE, we believe the collocated approach is still preferable. In this event we recommend that, between 2000 and 2005, the Board should review the enrollment needs of the area and the state response to meeting those needs and determine if additional site development is needed either for the community college or the branch campus.*

Staff Analysis and Comments: Staff note that this "contingency" recommendation reflects the consultant's awareness that additional wetlands and related ecological information is needed to definitively determine "build-out" capacity for any of the three sites found programmatically suitable for the collocated campus. In this regard, staff believe that the site ultimately selected for the collocated campus should be one that can accommodate the long-term enrollment need of 9,900.

Agency Comments: The participating institutions and the Office of Financial Management concur with the staff response. Both acknowledge the need to ensure that the site chosen for collocation has the capacity to accommodate the year 2010 enrollment goal of 9,900 student FTE for the collocated campus. However, as noted in the response to Recommendation #2, staff and the institutions believe that the collocated campus serving 9,900 student FTE will ultimately be insufficient to meet

(post 2010) area demand and that additional programs and campus sites/facilities will be needed.

MGT Recommendation #4: *We recommend that the Board establish policies for permanent collocation of the community college and the UW-Bothell which would put each party on an equal footing and ensure that maximum efficiencies are obtained.*

Staff Analysis and Comments: Staff concur with the consultant's recommendation that the Board establish policies for the collocated campus. Staff do not concur with the "permanent collocation policies" suggested by the consultant.[46] Staff feel that the Board should articulate broad guidelines expressing the policy level expectations of the Board with respect to the delivery of programs in a collocated environment. Staff believe that the participating institutions should use these guidelines in the formulation of an operating plan and agreement for the campus.

Agency Comments: The participating institutions and the Office of Financial Management concur with the staff response to the MGT recommendation.

MGT Recommendation #5: *We recommend that the Board endorse a near-term response to demonstrated needs in the area through support for added enrollment at the UW-Bothell and use the excess facilities at Lake Washington Technical College for either technical education offered by LWTC or academic transfer courses offered by an area community college.*

Staff Analysis and Comments: Staff concur with the consultant's recommendation provided that proposals for additional enrollments at area institutions are consistent with the Board's overall enrollment plan and the specific program/development plan for the collocated campus.

Agency Comments: The participating institutions and the Office of Financial Management concur with the consultant's recommendations.

---

[46] See: MGT final report, Appendix G (of the MGT document).

Public Hearing Comments: Much of the public testimony expressed the desire to see the "state" respond to the perceived unmet demand for postsecondary services in the study area. Many residents emphasized the urgency to respond to immediate needs as well as to develop long-term plans for the region.

MGT Recommendation #6: *We recommend that the Board endorse the extension of the current advisory committees into an area-wide advisory group to work with the collocated institutions and Lake Washington Technical College and area secondary schools in facilitating regional educational planning and working to reduce barriers of access to basic skills training, workforce training and academic education through the associate, baccalaureate and graduate levels.*

Staff Analysis and Comments: Staff do not concur with the consultant's recommendation. Staff believe that the retention of the separate groups is consistent with the recognition of the unique and separate roles and missions of the participating institutions and such retention should be considered in the development of policies and plans for the collocated campus.

Agency Comments: The institutions concur with the staff response. The Office of Financial Management does not disagree with the spirit of the staff and institutional response, but feels the exact composition and structure of the advisory function should be part of the collocation agreement to be developed by the participating institutions.

Public Hearing Comments: Members of various advisory groups to the institutions expressed their desire to retain the current structures for advisory/planning functions.

V. Staff Recommendations

In view of the staff analysis of the consultant's findings and recommendations, and in consideration of the public comment and state agency responses to the MGT recommendations, staff recommend that:

1. The Board support the creation of a new community college in the north King/south Snohomish Counties area and reaffirm its commitment to the continuation of the upper division and graduate level branch campus of the University of Washington.

2. The Board adopt the collocation of the new community college and upper division and graduate branch of the University of Washington as its preferred organizational model for meeting the higher education and workforce training needs of the north King/south Snohomish Counties area.

3. The Board support added enrollments and use of existing capacity at Lake Washington Technical College, area community colleges, and the UW branch campus at Canyon Park, to meet immediate postsecondary access needs and to complement the services to be offered at the collocated campus.

4. The Board adopt, by March 1, 1994, a philosophical statement of policy for the planning and operation of the collocated campus. This statement of policy should be prepared by HECB staff in consultation with the participating institutions and the Office of Financial Management.

5. The Board direct the participating institutions to develop and recommend, pursuant to the policies adopted under Recommendation #4 above, a joint planning and operating agreement for the collocated campus. Such agreement should address, but not be limited to, the following issues:

   A. Definition of the respective roles and authorities of the participating institutions in governance of the collocated campus.

   B. Designation of responsibility for managing the facilities planning and development process (including, responsibility for preparing the Environmental Impact Statement(s), and acting in the role of "owner" for the administration of Architectural/Engineering Agreements and Public Works Construction Contracts).

C. Specification of policies, procedures and authorities for the scheduling and assignment of common use program space and for the operations and management of central service functions and space.

Staff recommend that the Board direct the institutions to submit this agreement by June 30, 1994 to the Board for its review and approval. As part of this review and approval process, it is further recommended that the Board direct staff to consult with the Office of Financial Management and other appropriate agencies in developing recommendations for Board action on the proposed agreement. The Board should also direct the institutions to report on the status of the agreement by June 30, 1994 if, by that date, the agreement has not been perfected. If such report indicates that an impasse exists on any issues integral to the governance, planning or operation of the campus, then staff recommend that the Board make a final determination upon such issues.

6. The Board endorse the continuation of the existing institutional advisory groups and encourage their participation and representation in the development of the requested joint planning and operating agreement provided for in Recommendation #5 above.

7. The Board designate the Truly Farm site as the preferred location for the collocated campus and recommend to the Office of Financial Management that property acquisition procedures be initiated following:

   A. The final wetlands determination by the U.S. Corps of Engineers,

   B. Verification of the capacity of the site to fully accommodate the projected student enrollment level or 9,900 FTE pursuant to the final wetlands determination at an acceptable cost,

   C. Completion of a Preliminary EIS, and

   D. Securing a fair and reasonable purchase price for the property.

8. The Board recommend to the Governor and Legislature that the state retain ownership of Wellington Hills and that, notwithstanding current urban growth area boundaries, this property be considered a resource for meeting the future postsecondary needs of the region.